

## REMARKS

### Claim Rejection

From claim 4, X and Y being alkyl has been removed for the compounds of formula I, rendering the rejection moot.

Additionally, applicants added two new claims and respectfully and courteously request that the Examiner enter these claims as the examination and allowance thereof would require only minimal effort at this stage of prosecution for the following reasons.

New independent claim 43 recites a liquid crystal mixture which contains a compound of former claim 4 before the current amendments. Lind et al. does not relate to a liquid crystal mixture at all and thus this new claim is not obvious over said reference at all.

New independent claim 44 depends on new claim 43 and recites a lower value for the HTP as recited in example 1. For support see, e.g., page 45, line 1 to page 47, line 2, and page 2, line 28 to page 3, line 1.

### Withdrawn Claims

Withdrawn claims 8, 12 and 34 are directed to method/processes of use of the subject matter of the allowed claims. Applicants bring the attention of the Examiner to MPEP § 821.04, Rejoinder, which states that "if the elected invention is directed to the product and the claims directed to the product are subsequently found patentable, process claims [both process of making and using] which either depend from or include all the limitations of the allowable product will be rejoined." Accordingly, the rejoinder, examination and allowance of these non-elected claims is respectfully requested in accord with the rejoinder provisions of the MPEP.

Withdrawn claims 10 and 35, and new claim 42, are directed to products comprising the subject matter of the allowed claims. The articles of these product claims are combinations of the compounds of the elected and now allowed claims and other components. As such, it is respectfully submitted that the compounds of the elected claims and the combination of said compounds and other components are related as combination-subcombination. Since they are related as combination-subcombination, the standard for requiring restriction herein is not met.

In order to establish that combination and subcombination inventions are distinct, two-way distinctness must be demonstrated. To support a requirement for restriction, both

two-way distinctness and reasons for insisting on restriction are necessary , i.e. separate classification, status, or field of search. See MPEP §808.02. If it can be shown that a combination, as claimed

(1) does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability (to show novelty and unobviousness), and

(2) the subcombination can be shown to have utility either by itself or in other and different relations, the inventions are distinct. When these factors cannot be shown, such inventions are not distinct.

(Emphasis added.) (M.P.E.P. §806.05(c))

It is submitted that the first requirement for two-way distinctness is not established herein. The combination does require the particulars of the subcombination. The products of claims 10, 35 and 42 all require the exact same products (allowed compounds) of the same scope as the subcombination claims of the elected group. To this end, the combination claims are even dependent upon the subcombination-product claims and the subcombination-products are an essential distinguishing feature of the combination-products.

It is respectfully submitted that when the relationship between the claimed subject and the subject matter of these withdrawn claims is properly characterized, there is no basis for restriction herein. Thus, the restriction requirement should be withdrawn.

Moreover, the Patent Office has not established that it would pose a serious or undue burden on the Examiner to search all the groups. No further, or only a minimal, search would be necessary to allow the remaining groups since the elected claims on which these withdrawn claims depend are allowed. This is so because if the elected products (compounds) themselves are patentable, products comprising the said allowed compounds, or methods of use of said allowed compounds, should be also readily patentable as well.

Reconsideration is respectfully and courteously solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Csaba Henter/

---

Csaba Henter, Reg. No. 50,908  
Attorney for Applicants

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO & BRANIGAN, P.C.  
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1  
2200 Clarendon Boulevard, Suite 1400  
Arlington, VA 22201  
Telephone: 703-243-6333  
Facsimile: 703-243-6410  
Attorney Docket No.:MERCK-2991

Date: March 13, 2009

K:\Merck\2000 - 2999\2991\ReplyMar 09.doc